

AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

July 10, 2006 – 3:00 P.M.

Mayor's Pre-Council Chamber – Mobile Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Atlas Roofing
Property Address: 458 Government Street
Date of Approval: 6/15/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 50 year architectural grade shingles, charcoal in color.
2. Applicant's Name: First Christian Church of Christ, Scientist
Property Address: 1151 Government Street
Date of Approval: 6/16/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing pole sign with signage as per submitted design.
3. Applicant's Name: Sherwin Williams/Wrico Signs
Property Address: 1904 Government Street
Date of Approval: 6/16/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing signage with new signage matching existing in material. Profile and dimension as per submitted design.
4. Applicant's Name: Skip Shira
Property Address: 906 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 6/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Rehabilitate historic structure by converting from apartments to single family dwelling. Remove later doors and windows and replace with siding matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Feather in to existing. Remove second floor porch infill. Reconstruct front porch columns and railing using MHDC stock design #3. Construct deck at rear with lattice privacy panels as designed. Prep to paint. Colors to be submitted at a later date.

5. Applicant's Name: Bill Johnston
Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 6/16/06 jdb
Work Approved: Reroof using 30 year timberline shingles, pewter gray in color. Underlayment to be 30 lb felt. Repair any wood that is necessary matching the original in profile, dimension and materials.
6. Applicant's Name: Willa Washington
Property Address: 16 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 6/13/06 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct chimneys damaged by hurricane. Bricks and mortar to match existing in color and dimension.
7. Applicant's Name: Derrick Juzang
Property Address: 954 Church Street
Date of Approval: 6/13/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house the following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – Shire Green, SW2226
Window sash – Village Green, SW2237
Trim – antique white
8. Applicant's Name: Gulf Coast Homebuilders
Property Address: 352 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/19/06 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on front porch, siding and windows as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Install new roof with materials to match existing. Paint house to match existing color scheme. New color scheme to be submitted if a change of color is requested.
9. Applicant's Name: Charles Howard and Jim Wagoner, III
Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/19/06 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house in the existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood siding as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
10. Applicant's Name: Greg Cyprian
Property Address: 64 Etheridge Street
Date of Approval: 6/14/06 jdb
Work Approved: Replace roof using 25 year charcoal gray Timberline roof. Repaint house using BLP St. Anthony Street Grey with white trim. Tree removal to be approved by Urban Forestry.
11. Applicant's Name: Ralph Hargrove
Property Address: 105 Ryan Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/21/06 asc
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary using new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paitn new materials white to match existing.

12. Applicant's Name: Rob Wallace
Property Address: 1562 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/22/06 jss
Work Approved: Demolish burned building (Urban Development Inspection 6/21/06)
13. Applicant's Name: American Roofing and Construction
Property Address: 51 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 6/22/06 jss
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab charcoal shingles.
14. Applicant's Name: E and W Properties
Property Address: 503 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 6/22/06 jss
Work Approved: Paint building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body – SW Shower Green
Porch Deck – Bellingrath Green
Trim – White
Painted brick to remain existing color
15. Applicant's Name: Michael and Patsy Dow
Property Address: 1056 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 6/26/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on siding to match materials in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
16. Applicant's Name: Nextel
Property Address: 255 Church Street
Date of Approval: 6/26/06 weh
Work Approved: Install 6' antenna adjacent to existing 8' antenna as per submitted plans.
17. Applicant's Name: Chris Huff
Property Address: 11 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/26/06 weh by km
Work Approved: Repaint house front to match existing color scheme.

C. NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

D. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **012-05/06-CA** 110 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Norman E. Wood
Nature of Request: Alter historic residence as per submitted plans.

2. **069-05/06-CA** 350 West Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Steven Shivers/Don Williams Engineering
Nature of Request: Construct two story addition on north and south elevations as per submitted plans.

E. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **072-05/06-CA** 1058 Church Street
Applicant: Meg and Geoff McGovern
Nature of Request: Construct 2 car garage, gravel drive with concrete curbing, install 6' and 3' wood fence where shown. 6' fence to be left natural; 3' fence to be either painted or left natural.
2. **073-05/06-CA** 255 Roper Street
Applicant: John D. and Judy Anthony Baumhauer
Nature of Request: Construct decagonal orangerie as per submitted plans.
3. **074-05/06-CA** 109 LeVert Avenue
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Lyle Hutchisson/Lucy Barr Designs
Nature or Request: After-the-fact approval to retain hardi board siding on newly constructed addition.
4. **075-05/06-CA** 103 North Washington
Applicant: Emanuel AME Church
Nature of Request: Demolish burned building.

E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS:

F. ADJOURNMENT

Project Synopsis:

The applicants are requesting to extend the existing eaves of the structure to allow water to shed off the roof without affecting the wood siding. Currently the house has no overhang. In addition, the applicants are requesting to remove and reconstruct the existing gable on the north elevation, and at that time increase the height and change the profile of the existing gable approximately 4'-5" to accommodate additional living space in the attic. By increasing the pitch this will allow a flat roof section to become pitched. The additional attic space will require a new gable window on the north elevation and the addition of two dormers on the south elevation.

- A. EAVE EXTENSION** - The Guidelines state that "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained."
1. 110 Ryan Avenue, the Smith House, ca. 1928, is a one story frame residence constructed in the English Period Revival style.
 2. Currently there is no overhang, which has resulted in continued maintenance problems of the wood siding.
 3. The proposed eave extension would increase the size of the overhang by 11 ½".
 4. This change would not be noticeable as a majority of the houses in the area have overhanging eaves.
 5. While this change will affect the historic appearance of the eaves of the structure, the change is necessary for the long-term preservation of the entire structure.
- B. ENLARGING PITCH AND ADDING DORMERS TO ACCOMMODATE ATTIC EXPANSION**- The Guidelines state that "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained."
1. A proposed attic addition would increase the existing ridge height by approximately 4.5'.
 2. The additional 4.5' would alter the current appearance of the front and side elevations, therefore affecting the architectural and historic character of the structure.
 3. The proposed design increases the height of the existing gable 4.5' and the existing roof profile or rake is not repeated, therefore eliminating a character-defining feature of the structure.
 4. Dormers are a traditional way of creating added space in attics.
 5. The simple design of the proposed dormers relates to other simplistic design element on the existing structure.
 6. While the proposed changes are on secondary elevations, they change the overall character of the front elevation in height and design elements.
- C. ADDITION OF A PAIR OF FIXED CASEMENT WINDOWS WITH FANLIGHT TRANSOM ON NORTH ELEVATION**- The Guidelines state that "The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing."
1. The existing single window configuration on the north elevation is original to the 1928 structure.
 2. The proposed window configuration does not relate to any other design element on the existing historic structure.
 3. The addition of the proposed window configuration would impair the architectural integrity of the historic façade and create a false sense of history.

Staff recommends **Approval** of the following:

A. Eave overhang extension

Staff recommends **Denial** of the following:

B. Enlarging pitch and adding dormers for attic expansion.

C. Addition of new window design on the north elevation.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

069-05/06-CA 350 West Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Steven Shivers/Don Williams Engineering
Received: 6/26 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/10/06 1) 6/12/06 2) 7/10/06 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct side additions as per submitted plans.

STAFF REPORT

Project History:

This application was heard at the June 12, 2006 meeting. The Board tabled the request to construct additions as submitted. The Board felt that, as proposed, the addition would have a negative impact on the historic character of the building. The Board noted that the ratio of window to wall should be adjusted and that the window types already on the house should be replicated. Although the Board encouraged the applicant to consult with Staff to explore other options, there was no contact to discuss alternatives.

The application was resubmitted with revised window designs, however, the massing and scale were unaltered. For this reason, the original staff report has been resubmitted for Board review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district..."

STAFF ANALYSIS

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The ca. 1922 Quina house is a one story wood frame bungalow with a pop-up second floor in the middle of the roof.
2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Leinkauf Historic District.
3. The subject property lot measures 60' x 120'.
4. The applicants are proposing to construct additions on both the north and south elevations.
5. The addition to the north elevation is proposed to be constructed over an existing bump-out. This addition measures 12'-3" x 14' - 11" at the second floor level.
6. This addition occurs at a distance of 54' from the street.

7. There are no setback issues concerning this elevation, which establishes a side yard setback of 2'-6".
8. This addition would not exceed the perimeter of the footprint of the existing bump-out.
9. The addition to the south elevation is proposed to elongate a bump-out, to measure 26' - 7" by 14' - 0".
10. This addition occurs at a distance of 55' from the street.
11. A porte cochere is proposed for the first level of the south addition with a bedroom above at the second level.
12. The proposed addition will come within 2'-6" of the north property line.
13. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance would be applicable to this situation.
14. Siding material for both additions is wood lap siding to match existing.
15. Roof material and pitch for both additions is to match existing.
16. Windows are proposed to be wood double hung, true divided lite, six-over-six.
17. Windows on the first floor of the existing house are a variety of styles, but are predominately wood nine-over-one true divided lite.
18. Windows in the pop-up appear to be wood one-over-one.
19. Columns supporting the porte cochere are proposed to match those on the front porch, with brick plinths supporting three wood columns.
20. Chamfered brackets on the front porch will also be replicated on the porte cochere.

Staff recommends approval of the addition to the north elevation as submitted. Due to the small massing and scale, this addition should not pose an adverse affect to the historic structure.

Staff recommends denial of the addition to the south elevation as submitted. Due to the massing and scale, this addition would be highly visible from the street and would negatively impact the historic integrity of the structure.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

072-05/06-CA 1058 Church Street
Applicant: Meg and Geoff McGovern
Received: 6/26 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/10/06 1) 7/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct 2 car garage, gravel drive with concrete curbing, install 6' and 3' wood fence where shown. 6' fence to be left natural; 3' fence to be either painted or left natural.

STAFF REPORT

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district..."

STAFF ANALYSIS

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The ca. 1901 Laird House was originally built on Springhill Avenue but was moved to 1058 Church Street in 1999 to avoid demolition.
2. The applicants also own the lot at 1056 Church Street and are currently having the two lots combined.
3. The applicants are requesting to install a gravel drive with concrete curbing.
4. This type of drive meets the approved materials in the Design Review Guidelines.
5. The applicants are requesting to construct a two car garage measuring 23' wide by 32' long.
6. The proposed wood frame garage will be constructed on a concrete slab.
7. The proposed exterior material is hardi board clapboard with 5" lap.
8. The proposed windows are wood double hung, two-over-two sash.
9. The proposed single leaf doors are wood.
10. The proposed garage doors are automatic overhead doors with glass on the top row.
11. A porch measuring 8' x 23' is located on the west elevation.
12. Columns supporting this porch are chamfered 8x8 posts.
13. Porch floor to be brick basketweave.
14. Roof to be fiberglass asphalt shingles to match that on the main house.
15. A 3' wood picket fence is proposed to frame the front of the vacant lot to the east, and run a distance of 25' down the east property line and the east edge of the gravel drive.

16. A pair of 6' wide gates is proposed to span across the gravel drive.
17. This same 3' high picket fence is to be placed around the a/c units on the east side of the residence.
18. The applicants would like the option to either leave the fence natural or paint.
19. A 6' high fence is proposed for the north property line and the east property line.
20. This fence will match the fence existing behind the main house.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the condition that the following information be provided:

- Information on the garage doors
- Paint color for fence

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

074-05/06-CA 109 LeVert Avenue
Applicant: Lyle and Margaret Hutchisson/ Lucy Barr Designs
Received: 6/26 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/10/06 1) 7/10/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: After-the-fact approval to retain hardi board cement fiber siding.

STAFF REPORT

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that "The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change: ... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district..."

STAFF ANALYSIS

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. At the June 13, 2005 meeting of the Architectural Review Board, the applicants were granted approval to construct a two story side addition to the ca. 1929 residence.
2. The Certificate of Appropriateness issued stated that all new materials were to match the existing house in material, profile and dimension.
3. ARB staff received complaints regarding the installation of hardi board cement fiber siding.
4. Staff met on site with the designer, owner and contractor to discuss the complaint and violation.
5. Staff informed all present that according to the Design Review Guidelines, additions to existing historic structures must use material matching that of the original structure.
6. Staff did determine on site that the cement fiber siding does match the existing historic wood siding in profile and dimension.
7. Cement fiber siding is only allowed for new construction.
8. The applicants provided information on other Architectural Review Boards that have allowed the use of this material.
9. However, in reading the information, the material is only allowed to be used on non-contributing or non-historic structures within districts and in rare cases with extenuating circumstances on select historic properties.

Staff recommends that the Board determine the appropriateness of using synthetic materials for additions to historic structures.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS**

075-05/06 – CA 103 North Washington Street
Applicant: Emanuel AME Church
Received: 6/26/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/10/06 1) 7/10/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing historic residential structure damaged by fire.

STAFF REPORT

Staff Analysis:

After receiving the application to demolish this structure, Staff visited the site. It appears the majority of the fire was contained in the rear addition. Structurally, the main historic portion of the building appears fine. Fire did not penetrate the roof of the main house, nor did it damage the floor structure or flooring. Windows and doors were damaged or destroyed putting out the fire. Staff encourages Review Board Members to visit the site.

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was created in 1979.
 - 2. 103 North Washington Street is a one story wood frame Creole cottage with Colonial Revival influences.
 - 3. 103 North Washington Street is a contributing structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
 - 4. While listed as contributing, the structure has had incompatible alterations over time.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. 103 North Washington Street is an important building because of its location at the district boundary.

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 103 North Washington Street are no longer readily available.
 - 2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
 - 3. Though the removal of any historic building impairs the integrity of the district, it is the opinion of the staff that restoration costs for this building would be minimal. In the event that

reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 103 North Washington Street would be prohibitively expensive.

- D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood
 - 1. The subject property is one of numerous wood frame residences not only in the district but in the surrounding neighborhood.
 - 2. Removal of this residence would erode the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
- E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
 - 1. There is no information about site development, however MHDC staff did meet with representatives of the congregation about 2 years ago to discuss razing this structure and the one that burned to the immediate north to have additional parking for the church.
- F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
 - 1. The removal of 103 North Washington Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Marine Street.
 - 2. The removal of 103 North Washington Street would impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
- G. Content of Application
 - 1. Property information:
 - a. 103 North Washington Street was acquired by the applicant in 1989 for \$12,000.
 - b. The applicant states that the property was in poor condition due to a fire.
 - c. The property is currently unoccupied.
 - 2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant states that no alternatives were considered.
 - 3. Sale of Property by Current Owner
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that 103 North Washington Street has not been listed for sale.
 - b. Applicant states that there are currently no plans to sell the property.
 - 4. Financial Proof
 - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends denial of the request to demolish.